



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,702	04/05/2001	Dae-Suk Chung	AUS920010189US1	3977

7590

02/09/2005

Frank C. Nicholas  
CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
1603 Orrington Avenue, Suite 2000  
Evanston, IL 60201

EXAMINER
----------

CASIANO, ANGEL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/826,702	Applicant(s) CHUNG, DAE-SUK	
	Examiner Angel L Casiano	Art Unit 2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2182

***Response to Amendment***

The present Office action is in response to Amendment dated 04 August 2004.

Claims 1-20 have been canceled. Claims 21-32 are now pending.

***Drawings***

1. Previous Objection to the Drawings has been overcome with the corrections presented in the Amendment.

***Specification***

2. Previous Objections to the Specification have been overcome with the corrections included in the present Amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 27-28, 30, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claims 27-28 and 31-32 recite the limitation "**method**" in reference to claims 25-26 and 29-30, respectively. However, the parent claims disclose a computer system (claim 25) and a computer-readable medium (claim 29). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2182

6. Claim 30 recites the limitation "usable" in reference to claim 29. However, claim 29 discloses a computer-readable medium. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 21, 25, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta [US 6,212,565 B1].

Regarding claim 21, Gupta teaches a *method* for operating a computer system, including the step of storing a network address (see Abstract). In addition, the prior art teaches selecting a network address, *extracting* a truncated (see "root"; col. 8, lines 21-24) address from the network address ("URL"). This extraction is in response to the utilization (entering; col. 7, lines 63-67 to col. 8, lines 1-6) of a network address (URL) with the purpose of gaining access to the resource (web page). The resulting address is then stored with thin the computer system (see Abstract; col. 3,

Art Unit: 2182

lines 38-62). The prior art teaches the steps of “acquiring” and copying” as performed without user intervention (see “automatically”, col. 3, lines 58-62; col. 7, line 65).

Regarding claim 25, this constitutes the *computer system* for implementing the method disclosed in claim 21. The prior art teaches the limitations corresponding to claim 21. Accordingly, the present claim is rejected under the same basis.

Regarding claim 29, this constitutes the *computer-readable medium* for implementing the method disclosed in claim 21. The prior art teaches the limitations corresponding to claim 21. Accordingly, the present claim is rejected under the same basis.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 22-24, 26-28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta [US 6,212,565 B1] in view of Osaku et al. [US 6,061,738].

As for claim 22, Gupta does not explicitly teach a method including the step of “querying the computer system for a selection of the network address by one of user of the computer system in

Art Unit: 2182

response to an activation of an autosave feature”. Osaku et al. teaches, “it is common for computer users to store a URL in a computer file (folder) generally known as a bookmark” (see col. 1, lines 27-30). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the cited disclosures in order to obtain a folder, “for accessing a particular home page” in the future (see Osaku et al., col. 1, lines 29-30). Nonetheless, this folder is not disclosed at “autosave”. Regarding this limitation, Gupta suggests a folder on a computer usable medium, since it teaches *storing (saving) the network address* (see col. 7, lines 1-8). Figure 6 (Gupta) teaches the steps of accessing a page in response to an *automatic* request (see col. 7, lines 65-66).

As for claim 23, Gupta teaches the network address viewed as present using a network browser (see col. 1, line 36; col. 5, line 7).

As for claim 24, Gupta does not teach placing the extracted root address into a *predefined folder*. However, Osaku et al. teaches, “it is common for computer users to store a URL in a computer file generally known as a bookmark” (see col. 1, lines 27-30). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the method disclosed by Gupta by including bookmark folder/subfolder, in order to use it “for accessing a particular home page” in the future (see Osaku et al., col. 1, lines 29-30).

As for claims 26-28, these constitute the *computer system* for implementing the method disclosed in claims 22-24. The prior art combination teaches or suggests the limitations corresponding to claims 22-24. Accordingly, the present claims are also rejected under the same basis.

Art Unit: 2182

As for claims 30-32, these constitute the *computer-readable medium* for implementing the method disclosed in claims 22-24. The prior art combination teaches or suggests the limitations corresponding to claims 22-24. Accordingly, the present claims are also rejected under the same basis.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 04 August 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the Remark, Applicant argues that the Gupta reference does not teach the step of “automatically storing the extracted root address within the computer system subsequent to the utilization of the network address by the computer system to gain access to the resource”, as recited in claim 21. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The prior art teaches selecting a network address, extracting a truncated address from the network address (“URL”). This extraction is in response to the utilization of a network address (URL) with the purpose of gaining access to the resource (web page). That is, the method taught by Gupta utilizes the URL (entered for accessing a web page) and then truncates (extracts) the root address. This is disclosed by the reference from column 7, line 57 to column 8, and line 28.

### ***Conclusion***

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 2182


MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angel L Casiano whose telephone number is 571-272-4142. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alc  
04 February 2005

  
JEFFREY GAFFIN  
SUPERVISOR  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100